

REMARKS

A reconsideration is requested of Claims 1-13.

Claims 1-5 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kiyoshi et al.* (JP 02185975). Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nijse et al.* (WO99/17034) in view of *Kiyoshi et al.* Claims 1-6 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ooyama et al.* (EP 1035643) in view of *Kiyoshi et al.*

A disclosed embodiment of the present invention pertains to a device for processing a direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic component. Independent Claim 1 defines that positioning means position the component to be processed in a processing position. Magnetic field generation means generate a magnetic field that generates forces that act contactless on the component and in this way, bring about or support the positioning of the component. According to the claimed invention, the component to be processed is itself, a magnet to be positioned. None of the art of record disclose these patentable features.

In contrast, *Kiyoshi et al.* relates to forming a high purity and high quality thin film by suspending a substrate or substrate holder in a vacuum vessel in a mechanical, non-contact state. There is no explanation found on how the mechanical non-contact state is accomplished. The only citation of magnetic forces is found in the abstract, where it is mentioned in the alternative, that a non-contact state is based on a gas lift.

Moreover, the method described in *Kiyoshi et al.* is used for coating of wafers. It is clear to a person having ordinary skill in the art that wafers are made out of silicon or the like, which is non-magnetic. In order to use magnetic forces to support such wafers, the wafers have to be in contact with a magnetic or at least highly conductive wafer holder. As such, the magnetic forces do not act directly on the work piece, but rather on a sample holder. In contrast, the presently claimed invention relates to a device which directly supports the component by magnetic forces. This is accomplished when the component itself be either a "direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic component".

Accordingly, *Kiyashi et al.* fails to disclose the patentable features of independent Claim 1.

The Examiner seeks to rely on *Nijsse et al.* for making up for the foregoing deficiencies of *Kiyoshi et al.* However, *Nijsse et al.* discloses a magnetic bearing that can be used to support a work top or platform or table. The bearing in all cases is constructed of permanent magnets, which are positioned in such a way, that they generate repulsive forces to each other. Additionally, an attractive member is applied which also generates attractive forces to the moving permanent magnet (see Figures 6-9). The platform or table or work top to be positioned is mechanically fixed to one or more of the magnetic bearings described in *Nijsse et al.* However, the platform, table or work top is not the component to be processed, but rather a support thereof. In addition, *Nijsse et al.* makes absolutely no mention that the platform, table or work top be a direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic component, as required by independent Claim 1. Nor does *Nijsse et al.* mention

that a component to be processed thereon be a direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic component, as required by independent Claim 1.

In contrast, as described above, independent Claim 1 describes a device comprising positioning means and magnetic field generation means for processing a component, where the component has to be direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic. As described above, this means that the component to be processed is itself a magnet to be positioned. However, *Nijse et al.* does not disclose that the component to be processed is itself a magnet to be positioned. Accordingly, neither *Kiyoshi et al.*, nor *Nijse et al.* disclose the patentable features of independent Claim 1.

Finally, *Ooyama et al.* fails to disclose that which is missing from *Kiyoshi et al.* In particular, *Ooyama et al.* discloses a control apparatus for a magnetic bearing that can be used to support a magnetizable object. The bearing in all cases is constructed of one electromagnetic above and one electromagnetic below the object. *Ooyama et al.* does not claim the electromagnetic construction, but rather the details of the control system to position the object within the electromagnetic construction. In addition, *Ooyama et al.* does not disclose that the component to be processed is direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic. As such, both *Ooyama et al.* and *Kiyoshi et al.* fail to disclose that the component to be processed is direct-current-supplied or permanently magnetic, as recited in independent Claim 1.

The Examiner concedes that *Ooyama et al.* does not disclose a component to be processed in a processing position. However, the Examiner argues that in view of *Kiyoshi*

et al., it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the apparatus of *Ooyama et al.* in a processing system disclosed by *Kiyoshi et al.* to coat a component without imposing coating defects caused by holding means.

However, this argument is not accurate. To get a coating component without creating defects caused by holding means, it is necessary, especially for long components, that the component to be processed is a magnet itself, therefore preventing a gravity induced bending of the component. Using an apparatus of *Ooyama et al.* on both ends of a long component to be processed would not prevent the component from gravity induced bending. In fact, using the apparatus of *Ooyama et al.* at several positions along the long component would generate coating defects due to the mechanical contact between the apparatus of *Ooyama et al.* and the component to be processed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither *Ooyama et al.* nor *Kiyoshi et al.*, in combination or alone, disclose the patentable features of independent Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the device of independent Claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, is patentably distinguishable over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: February 26, 2004

By: Elaine P. Spector
Elaine P. Spector
Registration No. 40,116

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620